		for II per on
1	Stephen B. Russell, P.E. Bernice Marks	2500
2	5937 East Aster Drive	2001 MAR -2 A 10 06
3	Scottsdale, AZ 85254 (602) 604-4640	HEVIET OF US
4	(602) 601 1616	DIRECTOR DE LA COMPANIA DEL COMPANIA DEL COMPANIA DE LA COMPANIA D
5		The state of the s
6		
7		
8	IN THE UNITED STA	ATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
9	FOR THE DIS	STRICT OF ARIZONA
10	In re:	
11) CHARLES THOMAS BROWN d/b/a TOM)	Proceedings Under Chapter 7
12	BROWN PREFERRED TRUST) COMPANY,)	No. 97-14228 PHX GBN
13	Debtor,	Adv. 99-00746
14		AFFIDAVIT OF STEPHEN B. RUSSELL
15	MAUREEN GAUGHAN, Chapter 7 Trustee)	AFFIDAVII OF STELLIEN B. RUSSELL
16	Plaintiff/Judgment Creditor,	
17	v.)	
18	ANN AKAMINE, et al.,	
19	Defendants/Judgment Debtors.	
20		
21	STATE OF ARIZONA) ss.	
22	County of Maricopa)	
23	I Ctanhan D Duggall haine Suct dul	
		y sworn upon my oath, depose and say:
24	1. Sometime back I was named	as a defendant in an action brought by the Trustee
25	in the above-referenced case.	
26		

- 2. Periodically thereafter I received documents from the Trustee indicating that matters in the bankruptcy were being processed.
- 3. During 2000, I received correspondence from the Trustee's legal representatives inviting me to explain what documents I possessed reflecting transactions with Mr. Brown, and why judgment should not be taken against me and my wife, Bernice Marks.
- 4. I am not a lawyer nor have I obtained legal assistance in this matter prior to the date of receiving notice of judgment taken against me. I was under the reasonable belief that, based on my conversations with the Trustee's representatives, no judgment would be taken against me or my wife.
- 5. In response to the Trustee's legal representative's request that I meet with them and explain our dealings with Mr. Brown and further explain why judgment against us was not appropriate, I met with the Trustee's lawyers in early August, 2000, and provided them with detailed information about my single investment/loan with Tom Brown, and the various investment/loans of my wife.
- 6. In all conversations with the Trustee's legal representatives, I was acting on my own behalf as well as on the behalf of my wife, Bernice Marks.
- 7. The information I provided to the Trustee's legal representatives indicated that I was personally involved in a single transaction which I undertook in good faith and for which the Trustee's debtor received reasonable equivalent value. Additionally, the transaction in which I received payment from Tom Brown only resulted in the return of my principal amount plus no more than \$600 in interest, not the \$6,000 plus reflected in the default judgment.
- 8. The information I supplied about Bernice Marks' loans similarly sets forth the basis upon which she should be considered a good faith net creditor of the Ponzi scheme rather

than having received any profits, and also establishes that in each instance the debtor received reasonable equivalent value for any payment made to Bernice Marks.

- 9. My dealings with Mr. Tom Brown were in good faith and I was without information whereby I had any concerns about the source of Mr. Brown's funds or Mr. Brown's ability to repay without compromising payments to other creditors. This is also true of my wife.
- 10. During my conversations with the Trustee's representatives, I provided them with information detailing my inability to repay any judgment rendered against me and with information indicating that the same financial inability prevented me and my wife from obtaining the assistance of counsel.
- 11. In response to my conversation with the Trustee's legal representatives, I was informed that there was no desire on behalf of the Trustee to obtain a judgment against me or Bernice Marks if our financial condition were as represented, in that such a judgment would merely place us in bankruptcy in addition to Tom Brown. During such conversations, I actually provided the Trustee with our 1999 tax return as evidence of our financial condition.
- 12. Based upon my communication with the Trustee's legal representative, I justifiably believed and relied upon the belief that there was no need for me to obtain legal counsel to defend my interests and that no judgment would be obtained against me or my wife.
- 13. From and after August 2000, there have been no <u>individual</u> communications between the Trustee's legal representatives and me, or my wife, indicating that my private and individual communications and agreement with them were no longer capable of protecting us against a judgment obtained by the Trustee.
- 14. From and after August 2000, the correspondence and court documents that I received were directed to all defendants without reference to whether separate individuals

	A		
1	agreements or understandings had been reached with the Trustee's legal representatives. Had		
2	been aware that a default judgment was actually going to be obtained against me, I would have		
3 4	attempted to resolve this matter by raising whatever defenses I could consistent with the		
5	information I supplied to the Trustee in August 2000.		
6	Upon information and belief, we have viable defenses to the judgment including		
7	but not limited to, our good faith dealings with Tom Brown, our provision to Tom Brown of		
8	reasonably equivalent value for any payment made to us by Tom Brown, laches, statute of		
9	limitations, and that line of case law which holds that victims of a Ponzi scheme who invested		
10	or loaned money in good faith should not be penalized.		
11	DATED this day of February, 2001.		
12			
13	see attached		
14	STEPHEN B. RUSSELL		
15	SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me this day of February, 2001, be Stephen B. Russell.		
16			
17	Notary Public		
18	My commission expires:		
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

agreements or understandings had been reached with the Trustee's legal representatives. Had I been aware that a default judgment was actually going to be obtained against me, I would have attempted to resolve this matter by raising whatever defenses I could consistent with the information I supplied to the Trustee in August 2000.

Upon information and belief, we have viable defenses to the judgment including, 15. but not limited to, our good faith dealings with Tom Brown, our provision to Tom Brown of reasonably equivalent value for any payment made to us by Tom Brown, laches, statute of limitations, and that line of case law which holds that victims of a Ponzi scheme who invested or loaned money in good faith should not be penalized.

DATED this 28 day of February, 2001.

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me this 28 day of February, 2001, by Stephen B. Russell.

M. Tilden Moschetti, Notary Public Notary Public

My commission expires:

2003 स्कि । १

